(4)

DISINFECTION.

The usual statistics are given in Appendix IV. with regard to the operations at the two disinfecting stations at Belvidere and Ruchill. A proposal was put forward during the year to have a motor disinfecting car fitted with compressed air apparatus for a division of this work. The specification and designs of this special machine have been prepared, and there is hope that, before the summer of 1899, Glasgow will possess a special piece of mechanism for the speedy and effectual disinfection of the privies and ashpits within the City.

In concluding this report I beg to acknowledge the sympathetic co-operation of the Open Spaces and Sanitary Offices Committee and the Health Committee, and also the assiduity in their labours shown by the members of the staff.

I am, GENTLEMEN,

Your most obedient Servant,

P. FYFE.

City Analyst's Laboratory,
156 Bath Street,
Glasgow, 8*th October*, 1897.

GINGER CASE, No. 300.

Report by Robert Rattray Tatlock, Esq., F.R.S.E., F.I.C.

On Tuesday, 29th June last, A. Hamilton and W. T. Armstrong delivered to me, at my laboratory here, a sample of "Ground Ginger," 300, which then weighed 1¼ oz. I made an analysis of this sample, by which I ascertained that it contained 69 per cent. or thereby of "spent" or "exhausted" ginger, and I reported accordingly, in the usual way, my report bearing date 27th July.

The sample, when opened, had but little taste or smell of ground ginger.

"Spent" or "exhausted" ginger is the residue which is left after ginger has been operated upon for the purpose of extracting its most valuable constituent—the essential oil of ginger—which is then employed for the manufacture of ginger beer. The residue, which has thus been deprived of its essential ingredient, is composed mostly of starch and woody fibre, has little or no taste, smell, or flavour of ginger, and is frequently sold as genuine ginger, or mixed with the latter and the mixture sold as genuine ginger, although it is neither of the "nature, substance, or quality" of the genuine article.

The practice of selling this exhausted residue for genuine ginger is well known, and many convictions have been obtained in this country under the Act for this offence.

Ginger, and this sophisticated form of it, have been made the subject of study and research by many chemists, but particularly by Dr. Dyer, ex-President of the Society of Public Analysts, and Mr. Gilbard, and by Mr. Allen, ex-President of the Society of Public Analysts, and Mr. Moor. The results of their work are published in the *Analyst* for 1893 and 1894. The subject was also specially investigated in my own laboratory by my assistant, Mr. William Skinner, and the results published in the *Proceedings* of the Glasgow City Analysts' Society, 1894-5.

Dyer and Gilbard say :—"It is well known that ginger which has been 'exhausted' or 'extracted' by mineral water manufacturers finds a ready market as an adulterant of genuine ground ginger, and that the detection of such adulteration is infrequent, although dealers in honest spices have long groaned under the unfair competition to which such adulteration subjects them."

In extracting the ginger the solvent employed is usually weak spirit of wine, and it is self-obvious that, after the valuable constituent or essence of the ginger has been so dissolved out and abstracted, the remainder or residue must be very little worth, as it is wanting in the only element for which ginger is of value. The flavour and essential property of the ginger is gone, and it is of no value except as an adulterant of such substances as genuine ginger or of pepper, for both of which purposes it is employed.

Exhausted ginger stands in precisely the same relation to genuine ginger that exhausted tea does to genuine tea. It has been deprived of the only constituents for which it is of value.

It has been alleged that ginger is not a food in the proper sense of the term, as it is not eaten for the purpose of nourishment. I do not hold that view, but affirm that ginger is a food as far as the Food and Drugs Acts are concerned. It is as much a food as tea or as ardent spirits, both of which are subjects under the Acts, and special provision is made in these Acts to bring them under its operation. It was contended by the defence in the case of the Durham County Council *v.* Hood ("Food and Sanitation," Vol. IV., page 177), that, as Justices Hawkins and Lawrence had decided that baking powder was not a food, ginger should not be regarded as a food either. No conviction followed, but the bench took all the circumstances into account, which included a warranty.

In the case of James v. Jones, which was an appeal from the decision of Glamorgan Justices, Justice Hawkins gave the opinion that although he held that baking powder was not an article of food, *mustard, pepper, and salt* were *proper* foods, and surely ginger is necessarily in the same category. Like them, it is not eaten alone, or for the purposes of nourishment, but as a condiment or flavour.

In the cases of the Sanitary Authority of Cardiff against Walters ("Food and Sanitation," Vol. V., page 308), and of the Sanitary Authority of Trowbridge ("Food and Sanitation," Vol. V., page 314), the defendants pled that ground ginger *was not a food* within the meaning of the Act, but a conviction was *obtained in both cases.*

Numerous convictions have been made for the sale of spent ginger as the genuine article, both in England and Scotland, and five of these have been in Glasgow.

I have never known of a case in which the plea has been sustained that ginger was not a food.

I do not think that dealers in ginger would, for a moment, hesitate to express the opinion that to sell spent or exhausted ginger for ginger was a fraud. Indeed, on one occasion, some of the leading ones publicly expressed their opinion to that effect in the form of a declaration signed by four of the leading firms ("Food and Sanitation," Vol. IV., page 210).

There is no difficulty whatever in ascertaining whether or not ginger has been manipulated or operated on for the abstraction of its valuable ingredients. The very treatment to which it is subjected for this purpose leaves it impoverished in those substances which are soluble in the solvent which is employed to remove the essential oil of ginger. The most reliable is the soluble ash or *soluble mineral matter.* Ginger cannot be extracted by water or by weak spirit of wine without removing a corresponding proportion of this substance, and its normal proportion never falls below a certain figure. The lowest on record is 1·41 per cent., and it is the only one; the next lowest are 1·70, 1·71, and 1·71 respectively, so that 1·70 is a very low standard indeed to base upon. The average is 2·18 and the maximum 3·05 per cent. of soluble ash. All the authorities are agreed that the percentage of soluble ash is the all-important factor for determining the proportion of exhausted ginger.

The annexed table shows the percentage of soluble ash or soluble mineral matter and other constituents in 25 samples of authenticated genuine ginger, as ascertained by different authorities, and in addition, at the end, in the last two columns, respectively, are stated the same results in the case of a sample of ginger which was extracted by the Analyst who made the analysis, and of the sample in question—No. 300.

ANALYSES OF GINGER.

Samples Nos. 1 to 25 are authenticated Genuine Gingers.

Sample No. 26 is a sample of Ginger exhausted by weak spirit of wine by the Analyst (Mr. Skinner, for City Analyst).

Sample 27 is the one in question—No. 300.

Dyer and Gilbard.

"Analyst," Vol. XVIII., pages 197-201.

	Per Cent.					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Soluble Ash, - - -	2·4	3·0	2·3	2·4	1·9	2·6
Insoluble Ash, minus Sand,	·7	·9	1·3	1·6	2·2	1·3
Total Ash, minus Sand,	3·1	3·9	3·6	4·0	4·1	3·9
Sand, - - - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—
Soluble in Cold Water, -	—	—	—	—	—	—
Volatile Ether Extract, -	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fixed Ether Extract, - -	3·0	3·9	4·7	6·4	7·0	4·5
Alcohol Extract, - -	3·1	3·8	3·1	2·7	2·1	2·1

PEARMAIN.

"Analyst," Vol. XIX., pages 123-128.

	PER CENT.				
	7	8	9	10	11
Soluble Ash,	2·2	2·7	2·4	1·8	2·0
Insoluble Ash, minus Sand,	·9	1·2	1·3	3·2	2·5
Total Ash, minus Sand,	3·1	3·9	3·7	5·0	4·5
Sand,	—	—	—	—	—
Soluble in Cold Water,	—	—	—	—	—
Volatile Ether Extract,	—	—	—	—	—
Fixed Ether Extract,	3·2	3·0	2·5	5·0	4·2
Alcohol Extract,	2·7	3·1	3·4	2·9	3·0

ALLEN, No. 12; WATERHOUSE, Nos. 13-22.

"Analyst," Vol. XIX., pages 124-128.

	PER CENT.										
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22
Soluble Ash,	2·36	1·70	1·41	3·05	1·75	1·71	1·71	2·03	2·04	2·28	2·41
Insol. Ash, minus Sand,	1·18	—	—	·85	1·54	1·74	—	·78	1·58	1·38	1·49
Total Ash, minus Sand,	3·54	—	—	3·60	3·29	3·45	—	3·81	3·62	3·66	3·90
Sand,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Soluble in Water,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Volatile Ether Extract,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Fixed Ether Extract,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alcohol Extract,	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

SKINNER, for TATLOCK & THOMSON.

"Proceedings of the City Analysts' Society," 1894-95, page 7.

	PER CENT.				
	23	24	25	26	27
Soluble Ash,	2·66	1·92	1·96	·04	·52
Insoluble Ash, minus Sand,	1·16	1·52	1·48	1·20	1·18
Total Ash, minus Sand,	3·82	3·94	3·44	1·24	1·70
Sand,	—	—	—	—	·40
Soluble in Cold Water,	18·20	—	—	—	10·20
Volatile Ether Extract,	—	—	—	—	·89
Fixed Ether Extract,	3·35	—	—	—	4·54
Alcohol Extract,	5·96	—	—	—	3·08

ANALYSIS OF FIVE SAMPLES OF GROUND GINGER received from the Sanitary Inspector of Glasgow in the ordinary way, under the Food and Drugs Act, within the last six months.

	PER CENT.				
	No. 304. 29/6/97.	No. 324. 30/6/97.	No. 330. 30/6/97	No. 378. 28/7/97.	No. 382. 28/7/97.
Soluble Ash, - - - - -	2·37	3·02	2·42	2·36	2·62
Insoluble Ash, less Sand, - -	1·92	2·52	3·20	1·66	2·92
Total Ash, less Sand, - -	4·29	5·54	5·62	4·02	5·54
Sand, - - - - - - -	·38	·30	1·38	·36	·98
Soluble in Water, - - - -	11·50	11·40	12·70	10·70	16·30
Volatile Ether Extract, - -	·60	·74	1·11	1·30	1·68
Fixed Ether Extract, - - -	4·74	4·82	4·10	4·38	6·30
Alcoholic Extract, - - -	—	3·60	3·40	·5·84	6·54

R. R. TATLOCK.

CITY ANALYST'S LABORATORY,
156 BATH STREET,
GLASGOW, 20*th* *October*, 1897.

12*th March*, 1898.

DEAR MR. FYFE,

WHISKY.—“MALT” AND “RAW GRAIN.”

I take the earliest opportunity of replying to your favour of 2nd instant.

I understand your questions to be summed up in the following query :—Are there any chemical means of distinguishing between “Malt Whisky” and “Raw Grain Whisky,” or mixtures of the two, and of determining the relative proportions of the two when they are mixed.

As in many similar cases, we shall at once embark on troubled waters if we do not see eye to eye as to what we are to understand by these two terms, which are commonly and very glibly used by a mass of people who are absolutely unprepared to give any definition of either the one or the other. While, on the one hand, a good deal of whisky is made from malt alone ; on the other hand, no whisky is made exclusively from raw grain alone, but always with a certain proportion of malt; and from raw grain, without malt, whisky cannot be made at all. In face of the fact that more raw grain is used than malt in this country in making whisky, we must be very careful not to attribute to the spirit made from it noxious qualities that the other has not got, unless we are prepared to make good our assumption, which, I much fear, we should be quite unable to do. The bulk of the whisky sold in this country is made from raw grain, largely Indian corn, with about one-tenth of its weight of malt, and there is no finer whisky made. It is distilled in patent stills, and is remarkable for its purity and freedom from fusel oil. It is largely consumed as whisky alone, and is also much employed to mix with malt whisky, of which it reduces or diminishes the harsh taste, when that is too strong, producing a milder whisky, which seems to be much in demand by consumers. I do not know of any other “Raw Grain Whisky” than this unmalted grain spirit, distilled in patent stills, and if any one will inform me with regard to any other I shall feel much indebted.

I fear the public are hopelessly heterodox with regard to whisky, and, before replying to your question as to chemical tests, I should like to make it clear that my reply applies to “Malt Whisky,” that is, made from malt alone, and “Raw Grain Whisky,” that is, whisky or spirit made from any unmalted grain, such as Indian corn or maize, with about one-tenth of malt added, which is essential to its production. My reply then is, that there is no difficulty in distinguishing between *pot still* whisky, which is the former, and is always made in pot stills, and *patent still* whisky, which is the latter, as it is always made in patent stills. There are no chemical means, however, of ascertaining their proportions when mixed together, although a pretty fair opinion can be given as to the spirit being a mixture of the two, if it is such. For the purposes of a prosecution under the "Food and Drugs Act" this would be of no value, as in that case the proportions must be stated.

There is no legal definition of "Whisky," and that fact alone would, in my opinion, preclude the possibility of obtaining a conviction, even in the event of its being proved, which a chemist is quite competent to do, that a certain sample purchased under the Act consisted entirely of pot still spirit—for example, made entirely from Indian corn (unmalted, of course), with only about one-tenth part of malt added. Millions of gallons of such spirit are sold in this country as whisky, wholesale and retail, and, in my opinion, there is no finer or more delicious, or more wholesome, spirit made, from malt or anything else.

I fancy the object of acquiring the information you ask for in your letter, as regards chemical tests, is to ascertain whether there is any chance of being able to deal, under the Act or otherwise, with an "adulteration" in the form of "Raw Grain Whisky," which is assumed to be a noxious and objectionable spirit, as against "Malt Whisky," which is presumably a wholesome spirit. Unfortunately this takes the whole point for granted, in which you could not get any support from the Inland Revenue Officials, Somerset House, nor any others who have paid attention to the subject. It is all very well to assume that the so-called "raw grain" is responsible for the "free fights and unholy language" which are the culminating point of excessive drinking in too many instances, but unless there is some proof forthcoming more than the declarations of interested topers, I fear little good will be accomplished. So far as I am aware, there is no proof whatever that this raw grain whisky is capable of producing any violent physiological effects any more than the other. I wish carefully to safeguard myself against its being supposed that I have any sympathy with this theory, which is a very popular, but a very erroneous, one. On the contrary, this raw grain whisky is well known for the absence from it of any noxious quality, and many a cask of it I have bought from Messrs. Mowbray & Co., of Cambus, and consumed, with the aid of my friends, who always declared that "there was not a headache in a gallon of it."

To be plain, I am no believer in the hypothesis that these undesirable results are due to the "quality" rather than the "quantity" of the spirit imbibed, and I should think it is but fair that those holding such views should be called upon to give the evidence upon which their notions are based, and to produce some of the whisky which they allege is responsible. I have paid a good deal of attention to the subject, but have never been able to get further with those who have adopted this theory than that it "must be" the "quality" and not the "quantity" of the whisky imbibed, and that they "were told so" by the imbibers, who, of course, could not be expected to confess to over-indulgence as long as they could find a scapegoat in the "bad quality of the stuff," or in the supposed evil effects of "Raw Grain Whisky," a term which, I feel certain, few of them could define if they were asked to do so. I have never been able, nor has any one else, to obtain a sample of this whisky—commonly called "speel the dyke"—although I have earnestly tried for many years, yet to judge from the frequency of the "free fights" and "unholy language" which are the consequences of excessive whisky drinking, the distribution of this stuff in large quantity ought to be very universal.

A good many years ago I went with a friend, on a Saturday afternoon and evening, to twenty of the commonest public-houses in the lowest parts of Glasgow, including High Street, Saltmarket, Cowcaddens, Broomielaw, &c., and, under pretence of drinking, sat down in the "boxes" of these shops, and called for first two gills and then other two gills, which we then placed in bottles and carried away. I then made a careful analysis and examination of all the samples, both chemically and physiologically, but found nothing out of the way. Some were good and others were not so good, but none of them were worse than ordinary public-house whisky.

At that time, also, the Inland Revenue Authorities sent officers to Glasgow to purchase samples in a similar way, and with a similar object, but failed to find anything wrong, and reported accordingly.

Of all the hundreds of thousands of samples of whisky which have been purchased under every variety of circumstance during the last quarter of a century, and submitted to the Public Analysts for analysis, I am not aware of one instance in which it has been alleged that the spirit was of a noxious character, such as to produce the effects referred to.

Then, how do the Inland Revenue Officials view the matter? Let us look at some of the evidence which was given by them a few years ago before the Committee on "British and Foreign Spirits." Sir Lyon Playfair, himself a chemist, was Chairman of that Committee. On that occasion, Dr. Bell, C.B., F.R.S., Principal of the Somerset House Laboratory, gave his opinion, based on his examination of samples of whisky obtained in the ordinary way of consumers. Questioned by the Chairman, he said—

Question 911.—Have you made any attempt to obtain public house spirits from fairs and other places where people congregate together?

Answer.—We have not obtained any from fairs or races, because we did not know where to send for them; but we obtained samples from various towns, from the lowest part of these towns, where the lowest class of the working people would obtain their supplies.

Question 912.—From England, Ireland, and Scotland?

Answer.—From England, Ireland, and Scotland. Altogether

> we obtained 51 samples, and we subjected them to the usual qualitative test, and the results, so far as the purity of the spirit was concerned, were very satisfactory.

In giving his evidence to the same Committee, Mr. Samuel, Chemist-Principal of the Customs Laboratory, said, in answer to Mr. Boord—

Question 1531.—I daresay you have heard of what is called the maddening effect of new spirits?

Answer.—I have heard of it and read of it.

Question 1532.—Have you any opinion as to whether that is a correct description of the effect produced by new spirits?

Answer.—I have no distinct opinion on the question. I have been rather disposed to think it was the quantity, not the quality, that produced that effect.

Question 1533.—That is my opinion. I was going to ask you whether you agreed with me?

Answer.—That is my opinion.

Now, if these officials can find nothing wrong, where do our hopes of going one better come in?

A considerable number of years ago, in consequence of the popular belief in the Falkirk district that at the famous "Tryst" a whisky was sold in bothies on the ground that turned decent quiet men into devils if they consumed only the reasonable "one small glass," I requested the Public Analyst to procure for me and himself a sample of the spirit at any expense of trouble and cash. The task of procuring it was beyond his powers, however, as he failed, although any "yokel" could have as much as he pleased of it. It was said of this spirit that it had to be poured out every night, as it would not keep till next morning. Substances that won't keep for a day are unknown to chemists.

Of course I need hardly refer again to the fusel oil question. I think every one who is acquainted with the evidence that has been given by competent persons before the Committee on British and Foreign Spirits and the Committee on Food Adulteration knows that that ancient ghost is laid, and that the so-called "bad whisky" does not owe its undesirable qualities to fusel oil, which has been proven not to diminish by age.

To what, then, are we to attribute the terrible effects of which we are sometimes unwilling witnesses, and to what are we to impute the popular theory that new whisky or drugged whisky is the cause of these? Well, the effects are due to a variety of causes, such as,—taking too much and forgetting how much was taken,—to mixing drinks—that is, drinking whisky and beer promiscuously,—to lying about what is or has been drunk,—to drinking on an empty stomach or when the constitution is physiologically in a low state,—to personal idiosyncrasies, and,—to latent pugnacity. As for the popular theory, it is always easier to assume than to investigate, and anything that savours of mystery dies hard.

Your letter, I think, refers to the difference in price between malt whisky and raw grain whisky, but I do not think that this is of any real importance to the whisky drinker. There is not necessarily any difference in price, as, according to evidence, malt whisky can be bought at about the same price as the average of raw grain spirit. When you consider that the price of good malt whisky, apart from duty, which raw grain spirit has to pay equally with malt spirit, and apart from ageing, is rather less than one halfpenny per glass, the substitution of raw grain spirit, at, say, half that price, will not affect the pocket of the drinker much.

Of course, there is "*good whisky*" and "*bad whisky*," as there is good and bad anything else. There is harsh whisky and mellow whisky, and there is new whisky—both malt and raw grain—and there is old whisky—both malt and raw grain—and there can be no doubt that the old is better in both cases; and it can always be had by paying for it.

Finally, there is nothing to hinder whisky being drugged, for example, with sulphuric ether, but no one ever heard of its being done, and it would be difficult to understand the motive for it, seeing the drug is a stronger intoxicant, and scarcely less expensive. The Excise never heard of such a thing being done, although they are aware that some druggists in a certain part of Ireland have been in the habit of selling the ether, pure and simple, to customers, who used it for drinking. In this respect it is on the same footing as methylated spirits—as long as it is sold by its proper name, people may buy it and drink it, and no one can interfere.

To come to the practical aspect of the question, a Sanitary Officer purchases, for the purpose of prosecution under the Food and Drugs Act, a sample of whisky, and delivers it to the Analyst, who certifies that it is raw grain whisky, on whom then does the onus lie of showing that that is any worse than malt whisky. I fear there would be no proof forthcoming. Let those who allege that it is, come forward and state their reasons, and we shall then see whether their evidence would stand in a court of law.

I need not say that nothing will give me more pleasure than to co-operate with you in any way that you or the Health Committee may consider best in investigating this vexed question further, and I shall be glad to have a conference with you at an early date thereanent.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

R. R. TATLOCK.

APPEN

I. Nuisances.	Central District.										Eastern.		
	Bl.	1	3	6	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	7	8
Total Inspections made for discovery of Nuisances, ...	8843	5357	3184	2586	1142	1538	6388	2292	2763	3523	31633	14273	982
Nuisances discovered and recorded,	1254	819	367	366	184	250	931	356	309	589	2930	1275	122
Do. removed or remedied, ...	1243	806	369	361	175	236	927	381	324	606	2883	1279	112
Consisting of accumulations of Garbage on Roofs, Courts, &c., or in Empty Houses or Cellars, or open wastage, ...	91	29	24	29	10	21	31	17	11	21	134	34	2
Apartment, Lobby, or W.C., with insufficient light or ventilation, ...	19	4	6	...	1	...	...	12	3	1	55	17	4
Animals or Poultry kept, so as to cause a nuisance, ...	...	...	3	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	2
Bad Smells, or Diphtheria or Enteric Fever in Dwelling, ...	33	23	6	4	1	2	7	6	2	...	49	20	2
Dwellings without Water Supply, ...	41	26	19	13	1	3	8	14	5	7	66	46	3
Dead Animal Matter under Floor, ...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	2	...	...	1	1	...
Defective Window in Dwelling, ...	...	3	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	2	73	7	[illegible]
Domestic Water Supply from Cistern in W.C., or Cistern in Attic foul and uncovered, ...	2	...	1	1	...	...	1	1	...	...	15	...	4
Drains, Soil-pipes, Branches, &c., choked, defective, or out of repair,	278	175	94	49	44	39	211	57	45	73	713	368	19
External Walls of Dwellings, Stairs, Lobbies, or Closets, filthy, ...	244	143	50	33	55	53	251	49	48	95	767	98	29
Internal Walls or Floors of House, or W.C., or Lobbies, or Stairs, filthy,	51	69	16	75	8	30	154	61	65	234	184	123	14
House Damp, or otherwise rendered unfit for habitation, ...	3	2	3	54	3	...	1	2	2	48	16	17	11
Sink, or W.C., or Trap, choked or broken, or out of repair, ...	204	167	77	58	18	30	90	71	93	62	334	288	17
Nuisances in Bakehouses, ...	26	6	...	1	2	...	12	10	...	1	1	1	1
Roofs, Walls, or Ceilings of Dwellings broken or out of repair, ...	8	6	4	1	2	3	15	4	7	4	43	58	3
Rhones, Pipes, or Gutters broken or out of repair, ...	35	20	18	14	11	16	44	7	11	17	102	37	6
Smoky Vents, or Back Smoke, causing a nuisance, ...	2	7	3	1	1	2	1	1	1	...	11	12	9
Sink accommodation defective, or new required, ...	5	3	1	2	1	...	2	3	5	...	22	...	1
Water-Closet accommodation required	9	4	7	...	7	13	23	2	7	8	61	20	3
Water-Closet defective in construction, ...	31	10	2	1	...	...	1	3	...	1	5	2	...
Water-Closet accommodation in Workshops defective, ...	18	28	1	5	1	7	1	11	...	3	1	3	...
Workshops filthy, ...	52	49	3	1	2	6	6	25	1	8	2	3	1
Workshops overcrowded, ...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	...	1	...	...
Workshops defective in ventilation or light, ...	3	1	...	...	...	...	...	1	...	1	2	1	[illegible]
Reports of Waste of Water to Mr. Gale, ...	49	15	10	6	2	2	24	8	9	9	27	25	1
Reported to Master of Works, ...	38	15	21	13	5	9	43	13	8	11	198	97	3
Reported to Procurator-Fiscal for prosecution before the Sheriff, ...	...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...
Summoned before the Police Magistrates, ...	1	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	...	1	...

Houses closed under Section 32, Glasgow Police Act, 1890—

1 Apartment.	2 Apartments.	3 Apartments.
104	45	3

152 in all.